



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/039,153	01/03/2002	Thomas E. Creamer	BOC9-2001-0013 (248)	9334
40987	7590	03/22/2006	EXAMINER	
AKERMAN SENTERFITT			DEANE JR, WILLIAM J	
P. O. BOX 3188				
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/039,153	CREAMER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> William J. Deane	<b>Art Unit</b> 2642	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-10,12-25 and 27-29 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-10,12-25 and 27-29 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.   |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 2, 4 – 5, 7 – 10, 12 – 13, 15 – 19, 22 – 23 and 27 – 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,188,757 (Malik) in view of U.S. 6,385,311 (Bauer et al.).

With respect to claims 1, 9, 17, 22, 27 - 29 Malik teaches the claimed subject matter as can be seen at Abstract, Col. 8, lines 21 – 64, Col. 12, lines 17 – 48, note Col. 25, starting at line 45 and Col. 26, starting at line 27. Also note Figs.

What Malik et al. does not explicitly teach is deactivating the feature at the end of the call, however Bauer teaches such is old in the art (see Col. 2, lines 28 – 31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated such a means for deactivating a service feature at the end of a call as taught by Bauer et al. into the Malik et al. system as another obvious means for deactivating a service feature. Note Malik uses a timer or end of a rental agreement to end a call. With respect to reallocating the service feature, note that Malik “rents” service features, which inherently reallocates the services.

With respect to claims, 2, 4, 7, 10, 12, 15, 19 note use of public feature codes (POFC) at Col. 16, line 7 and also note Col. 23, lines 30 – 39 and Figs. 3 and 4

With respect to claim 5, 13, 18, 23 reserving a pool of resources, obviously whether only one service provider or multiple service providers are used a pool of resources are used. If no resources were reserved for temporary use, then the system could not work.

With respect to claim 8, 16 note Col. 18, lines 17 – 31 and Col. 22, line 49.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, 14 and 20 – 21, 24 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik et al./ Bauer et al. and further in view of Lawrence et al. and the instant application.

With respect to claims 6 14, 20 – 21 and 24 – 25, Malik/Bauer et al. teach the claimed system and method accept for explicitly talking about multiplexing and circuitry therefor. However, it is noted that this is the way things are done. That is, note Fig. 2 of the instant application, again the only thing missing is the multiplexing. If 2 services are on one LIC, are these services not multiplexed onto 122a? Even if one disagrees, the examiner notes that multiplexing is so notoriously old in the art that no reference need be supplied. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use

Art Unit: 2642

multiplexing wherever it was deemed necessary. In addition, it is believed by the examiner that multiplexing is inherent in the Malik/Bauer device. For example, if a user wanted 2 feature services and one network offered one service and another network service offered another, would the services not be multiplexed? Even if applicant were to argue this point, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to multiplex the 2 services together. Also note multiple services at Col. 27, lines 50 – 62.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: note the Abstract and Figs. of the references cited on the accompanying 892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bill Deane whose telephone number is (571) 272-7484. In addition, facsimile transmissions should be directed to Bill Deane at facsimile number (703) 273-8300.

11March2006



WILLIAM J. DEANE, JR.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER